



IFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Ser. No: 10/783,433
Filing date: 2/23/04
Inventor.: Todd Domke
GPU: 1744

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria VA. 22313-1450

AMENDMENT

In response to the office action of 2/7/05:

We have enclosed a request for extension of time, a fee in support thereof. Also we enclose a substitute page 2, including corrections to respond to the examiner's concerns on page 2 of the recent action as to what is indicated by numeral 8 and numeral 12 in the drawings. It is not believed that a drawing correction is needed at this time and this possibility (drawing not needed) is suggested by the examiner's comments in that section. We also enclose a corrected sheet showing the old page 2, with those changes by means of [] and --.

We have changed the term: "bristles" to --tufts-- in the substitute page as this seems more appropriate. It is obvious from the drawings there are smaller members (bristles) that form the larger tufts that are the working members of the brush. The examiner's comments on page 4 make it clear that each tuft contains more than one bristle. Further we agree with the examiner's conclusion in the middle of page 4, that it is inappropriate to make reference to "one bristle" in thickness. We agree with the examiner's reasoning here and we feel that correction of "bristles" to --tufts-- is appropriate and is not new matter.

Furthermore we note the examiner's concerns on page 3 of the action indicating that the spacing of the lines is difficult to read. We had previously submitted a sub spec 7/21/04 in response to notice to correct. Is this not sufficient?

Remarks:

In the claims, we cancel claims 1-2 and have submitted a new set of claims 3-4 on a new sheet, which is double spaced. The claims are novel and non obvious over the prior art for the foregoing reasons: